Pam. misc. church 1907

The Church
and
International Peace

A Series of Papers by the Trustees of

THE CHURCH PEACE UNION

V

The Way to Disarm: A Practical Proposal

by

Hamilton Holt

THE CHURCH PEACE UNION

70 Fifth Avenue

NEW YORK

The Church and International Peace

A uniform series of papers by the Trustees of The Church Peace Union, treating the problems of war and peace from the point of view of religion, and especially emphasizing the message the Church should have for the world in this time of war.

ALREADY PUBLISHED

1. The Cause of the War, by Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D.D.
2. The Midnight Cry, by Rt. Rev. David H. Greer, D.D.
3. The Scourge of Militarism, by Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D.
4. Europe's War, America's Warning, by Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, Ph.D.
5. The Way to Disarm, by Hamilton Holt.

IN PREPARATION

1. The Breakdown of Civilization, by Rev. William Pierson Merrill, D.D.
2. After the War—What? by Rev. Francis E. Clark, D.D.
3. Our Grounds of Hope, by Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D.
4. The United Church and the Terms of Peace, by Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D.
5. The Church's Mission as to War and Peace, by Rev. Junius B. Remensnyder, D.D.
6. Adequate Armaments, by Prof. William I. Hull.

The Way to Disarm: A Practical Proposal

By Hamilton Holt
Editor of The Independent

In his famous essay, Perpetual Peace, published in 1795, Emmanuel Kant, perhaps the greatest intellect the world has ever produced, declared that we never can have universal peace until the world is politically organized and it will never be possible to organize the world politically until the people, not the kings, rule. And he added that the peoples of the earth must cultivate and attain the spirit of hospitality and good will towards all races and nations.

If this be the true philosophy of peace, then when the Great War is over, and the stricken sobered peoples set about to rear a new civilization on the ashes of the old, they cannot hope to abolish war unless they are prepared to extend democracy everywhere, to banish hatred from their hearts, and to organize the international realm on a basis of law rather than force.

The questions of the extension of democracy and the cultivation of benevolence are domestic ones. They can hardly be brought about by joint action of the nations. World organization and disarmament, however, can be provided for in the terms of peace or by international agreement thereafter. As the United States seems destined to play an important part in the great reconstruction at the end of the war, this is perhaps the most important question now before American statesmanship.

LAW OR WAR

The only two powers that ever have governed or ever

can govern human beings are reason and force—law and war. If we do not have the one we must have the other.

The peace movement is the process of substituting law for war. Peace follows justice, justice follows law, law follows political organization. The world has already achieved peace, through justice, law and political organization in hamlets, towns, cities, states and even in the forty-six sovereign civilized nations of the world. But in that international realm over and above each nation, in which each nation is equally sovereign, the only final way for a nation to secure its rights is by the use of force. Force, therefore—or war as it is called when exerted by a nation against another nation—is at present the only final method of settling international differences. In other words, the nations are in that state of civilization to-day where, without a qualm, they claim the right to settle their disputes in a manner which they would actually put their own subjects to death for imitating. The peace problem, then, is nothing but the problem of finding ways and means of doing between the nations what has already been done within the nations. International law follows private law. The "United Nations" follow the United States.

At present international law has reached the same state of development that private law reached in the tenth century. Professor T. J. Lawrence (in his essay The Evolution of Peace) distinguishes four stages in the evolution of private law:

1. Kinship is the sole bond; revenge and retaliation are unchecked, there being no authority whatever.

2. Organization is found an advantage and tribes under a chief subdue undisciplined hordes. The right of private vengeance within the tribe is regulated but not forbidden.

3. Courts of justice exist side by side with a limited right of vengeance.

4. Private war is abolished, all disputes being settled by the courts.

It is evident that in international relations we are entering into the third stage, because the nations have already

created an international tribunal which exists side by side with the right of self-redress or war.

LIKE THE AMERICAN CONFEDERATION

Furthermore, a careful study of the formation of the thirteen American colonies from separate states into our present compact Union discloses the fact that the nations to-day are in the same stage of development that the American colonies were about the time of their first confederation. As the United States came into existence by the establishment of the Articles of Confederation and the Continental Congress, so the "United Nations" came into existence by the establishment of The Hague Court and the recurring Hague Conferences; The Hague Court being the promise of the Supreme Court of the world and The Hague Conferences being the prophecy of the parliament of man. We may look with confidence, therefore, to a future in which the world will have an established court with jurisdiction over all questions, self-governing conferences with power to legislate on all affairs of common concern, and an executive power of some form to carry on the decrees of both. To deny this is to ignore all the analogies of private law and the whole trend of the world's political history since the Declaration of Independence. As Secretary of State Knox said not long ago:

"We have reached a point when it is evident that the future holds in store a time when war shall cease, when the nations of the world shall realize a federation as real and vital as that now subsisting between the component parts of a single state."

It would be difficult to recall a more far-visioned statement than this emanating from the chancellery of a great state. It means nothing less than that the age-long dreams of the poets, the prophets and the philosophers have at last entered the realms of practical statesmanship.

But now the Great War has come upon us. "When the storm is spent and the desolation is complete; when the flower of the manhood of Europe has past into eternal night; when

famine and pestilence have taken their tithe of childhood and age," will then the exhausted and beggared that live on be able to undertake the task of establishing that World Government which the historian Freeman has called "the most finished and the most artificial production of political ingenuity"?

THE HAGUE OR THE LEAGUE OF PEACE

If it can be done at all it can only be done in one of two ways.

First. By building on the foundations already laid at The Hague, the Federation of the World.

Second. By establishing a great Confederation or League of Peace, composed of those few nations who through political evolution or the suffering of war have at last seen the light and are ready here and now to disarm.

It is obvious that the time is scarcely ripe for voluntary and universal disarmament by joint agreement. There are too many medieval-minded nations still in existence. The Federation of the World must still be a dream for many years to come.

The immediate establishment of a League of Peace, however, would in fact constitute a first step toward world federation and does not offer insuperable difficulties. The idea of a League of Peace is not novel. All federal governments and confederations of governments, both ancient and modern, are essentially leagues of peace, even though they may have functions to perform which often lead directly to war.

The ancient Achaian League of Greece, the Confederation of Swiss Cantons, the United Provinces of The Netherlands, the United States of America, and the Commonwealth of Australia are the most nearly perfect systems of federated governments known to history. Less significant, but none the less interesting to students of government, are the Latin League of thirty cities, the Hanseatic League, the Holy Alliance, and in modern times, the German Confederation. Even the recent Concert of Europe was a more or less inchoate

League of Peace. The ancient leagues, as well as the modern confederations, have generally been unions of offense and defense. They stood ready, if they did not actually propose, to use their common forces to compel outside states to obey their will. Thus they were as frequently leagues of oppression as leagues of peace.

THE PROBLEM OF FORCE

The problem of the League of Peace is therefore the problem of the use of force. Force internationally expressed is measured in armaments. The chief discussion which has been waged for the past decade between the pacifists and militarists has been over the question of armaments. The militarists claim that armaments insure national safety. The pacifists declare they inevitably lead to war. Both disputants insist that the present war furnishes irrefutable proof of their contentions.

As is usual in cases of this kind the shield has two sides. The confusion has arisen from a failure to recognize the threefold function of force:

1. Force used for the maintenance of order—police force.
2. Force used for attack—aggression.
3. Force used to neutralize aggression—defense.

Police force is almost wholly good.

Offense is almost wholly bad.

Defense is a necessary evil, and exists simply to neutralize force employed for aggression.

The problem of the peace movement is how to abolish the use of force for aggression, and yet to maintain it for police purposes. Force for defense will of course automatically cease when force for aggression is abolished.

The chief problem then of a League of Peace is this: Shall the members of the League "not only keep the peace themselves, but prevent by force if necessary its being broken by others," as ex-President Roosevelt suggested in his Nobel Peace Address delivered at Christiania, May 5, 1910? Or

shall its force be exercised only within its membership and thus be on the side of law and order and never on the side of arbitrary will or tyranny? Or shall it never be used at all? Whichever one of these conceptions finally prevails the Great War has conclusively demonstrated that as long as War Lords exist defensive force must be maintained. Hence the League must be prepared to use force against any nations which will not forswear force. Nevertheless a formula must be devised for disarmament. For unless it is a law of nature that war is to consume all the fruits of progress disarmament some how and some way must take place. How then can the maintenance of a force for defense and police power be reconciled with the theory of disarmament?

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE LEAGUE

In this way: Let the League of Peace be formed on the following five principles:

First. The nations of the League shall mutually agree to respect and guarantee the territory and sovereignty of each other.

Second. All questions that cannot be settled by diplomacy shall be arbitrated.

Third. The nations of the League shall provide a periodical assembly to make all rules to become law unless vetoed by a nation within a stated period.

Fourth. The nations shall disarm to the point where the combined forces of the League shall be a certain per cent higher than those of the most heavily armed nation or alliance outside of the League. Detailed rules for this pro rata disarmament shall be formulated by the Assembly.

Fifth. Any member of the League shall have the right to withdraw on due notice, or may be expelled by the unanimous vote of the others.

The advantages that a nation would gain in becoming a member of such a league are manifest. The risk of war would be eliminated within the League. Obviously the only things that are vital to a nation are its land and its independ-

ence. Since each nation in the League will have pledged itself to respect and guarantee the territory and the sovereignty of every other, a refusal to do so will logically lead to compulsion by the other members of the League or expulsion from the League. Thus every vital question will be automatically reserved from both war and arbitration while good faith lasts. All other questions are of secondary importance and can readily be arbitrated.

By the establishment of a periodical assembly a method would be devised whereby the members of the League could develop their common intercourse and interests as far and as fast as they could unanimously agree upon ways and means. As any law could be vetoed by a single nation, no nation could have any fear that it would be coerced against its will by a majority vote of the other nations. By such an assembly the League might in time agree to reduce tariffs and postal rates and in a thousand other ways promote commerce and comity among its members.

As a final safeguard against coercion by the other members of the League, each member will have the right of secession on due notice. This would prevent civil war within the League. The right of expulsion by the majority will prevent one nation by its veto power indefinitely blocking all progress of the League.

THE SCRAP OF PAPER

But it will be said that all these agreements will have no binding effect in a crisis. A covenant is a mere "scrap of paper" whose provisions will be violated by the first nation which fancies it is its interest to do so. In order to show that their faith is backed up by deeds, however, the nations on entering the League agree to disarm to a little above the danger point. This is the real proof of their conversion to the peace idea.

It will be noticed that no attempt is made to define how the force of the League shall be exerted. This is left for the decision of the Assembly of the League. The suggestion that

"the nation shall disarm to the point where the combined forces of the League shall be a certain per cent higher than those of the most heavily armed nation or alliance outside the League," implies that the forces of the League shall be used for the neutralization of the aggressive force of nations outside the League—that is, for defense. But shall not the force of the League be also used as police power, that is, aggressively to maintain international law and order? A League with power to exert its will without any constitutional limitations might easily become a League of Oppression. It would have the right to be judge and sheriff in its own cause, a violation of the first principles of justice.

It would not be over-sanguine to expect that the Assembly of the League would vote that the armaments of the League should be brought into regular and concerted action for compelling obedience to the judicial decisions of the Court of the League both among members of the League and those outside who have agreed to this method of settling their disputes. It may even be anticipated that the force of the League will be used to assist one of the members of the League in a controversy with a nation outside the League that has not previously agreed to resort to arbitration and that refuses so to agree upon request. Such an agreement would tend to enthrone law and suppress arbitrary action. Entering a League with such a policy would not subject the United States to the necessity of waging war thru the erroneous action of its allies in an "entangling alliance," but only to extend the reign of law. This is the fundamental purpose of our Government and perhaps the United States is now ready to go thus far.

Thus the nations which join the League will enjoy all the economic and political advantages which come from mutual co-operation and the extension of international friendship and at the same time will be protected by an adequate force against the aggressive force of the greatest nation or alliance outside the League. The League therefore reconciles the demand of the pacifists for the limitation of armaments and eventual dis-

armament and the demand of the militarists for the protection that armament affords. Above all the establishment of such a league will give the liberal parties in the nations outside the League an issue on which they can attack their governments so as sooner or later to force them to apply to the League for membership. As each one enters there will be another pro rata reduction of the military forces of the League down to the armament of the next most powerful nation or alliance outside it; until finally the whole world is federated in a brotherhood of universal peace and armies and navies are reduced to an international police force.

This is the plan for a League of Peace. Is the hour about to strike when it can be realized? If only the United States, France and England would lead in its formation, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Argentina, Brazil, Chile and others might perhaps join. Even if Russia and Germany and Japan and Italy stayed out, the League would still be powerful and large enough to begin with every auspicious hope of success.

THE DESTINY OF THE UNITED STATES

It would seem to be the manifest destiny of the United States to lead in the establishment of such a league. The United States is the world in miniature. The United States is the greatest league of peace known to history. The United States is a demonstration to the world that all the races and peoples of the earth can live in peace under one form of government, and its chief value to civilization is a demonstration of what this form of government is.

Prior to the formation "of a more perfect union" our original thirteen states were united in a confederacy strikingly similar to that now proposed on an international scale. They were obliged by the articles of this confederacy to respect each other's territory and sovereignty, to arbitrate all questions among themselves, to assist each other against any foreign foe, not to engage in war unless called upon by the confederation to do so or actually invaded by a foreign foe,

and not to maintain armed forces in excess of the strength fixed for each state by all the states in congress assembled.

It is notable that security against aggression from states inside or outside the American Union accompanied the agreement to limit armaments. Thus danger of war and size of armaments were decreased contemporaneously.

It is also notable that from the birth of the Republic to this hour every President of the United States has advocated peace through justice. From the first great Virginian to the last great Virginian, all have abhorred what Thomas Jefferson called "the greatest scourge of mankind."

When the Great War is over and the United States is called upon to lead the nations in reconstructing a new order of civilization, why might not Woodrow Wilson do on a world scale something similar to what George Washington did on a continental scale?

Stranger things than this have happened in history. Let us add to the Declaration of Independence a Declaration of Interdependence.

A FEW COMMENTS ON MR. HOLT'S PROPOSAL

JOHN BASSETT MOORE

Formerly Councillor of the Department of State

The utmost space that could be allotted to a mere comment on your editorial, "The Way to Disarm: A Practical Proposal," would not suffice for the expression of a full and reasoned opinion upon that very interesting and able paper. The tendency and general objective are altogether commendable; the principle is sound. It is possible, however, that some of the passages in your argument may be interpreted more broadly than perhaps was intended.

You remark:

"Peace follows justice, justice follows law, law follows political organization .... The world has already achieved peace thru justice, law and political organization in hamlets, towns, cities, states and even in the forty-six sovereign civilized nations of the world. .... The peace problem, then, is nothing but the problem of finding ways and means of doing *between* the nations what has already been done *within* the nations."

If this means that political organization and the regular administration of justice have, by creating legal peace within the state, diminished the use of violence and tended to prevent war, we all must concur; but, if we are asked to go farther, and to assume that the imposition upon nations of a central authority or their entrance into a league will, besides creating legal peace, efficaciously assure the maintenance of actual peace, we ought, before answering, to reckon with certain obvious facts. Altho municipal law furnishes within the state the most ample safeguards of organization, conditions not of legal but of actual warfare, such as the killing of men, the destruction of property and the prostration of legal administration, now and then disturb our hamlets, towns, cities and states. In reality, when we come to consider war and

peace, we are brought face to face with the sober fact that the tendency of large masses of men (as lately illustrated, shall we say, in the progressive community of Colorado and the ancient community of Ulster?) to oppose the law, whether because they believe it to be unjust, because they reject its official interpretation, or because they wish to effect some quick or radical change, is a human element of fundamental importance, which has caused civil wars to occur during the past century with remarkable frequency. Of these perhaps the most serious is that which befell our own "League of Peace"—a conflict generally believed to have been accelerated by a judicial decision and unquestionably precipitated at a moment when we had substantially neither army nor navy. Only last year we recognized with many congratulatory phrases the Republic of China, in whose origin and maintenance, just as in the case of many other revolutions, military force has been an appreciable factor. The same tendency or impulse of large masses of men to gain their ends by force likewise produces international wars.

No doubt one of the best assurances against the indulgence of this propensity is a regulated governmental control, and for this reason I applaud your advocacy of a practical step toward international federation for the attainment of that end, without intending, however, to countenance the supposition that we may slumber upon any contrivance, parliamentary, judicial or otherwise, municipal or international, as an all-sufficient safeguard against outbreaks of violence. In a small volume which I published two years ago I exprest my profound conviction, which reflection and subsequent events have served only to confirm, that questions of war and of peace must continue chiefly to depend "upon the cultivation of the spirit and habit of justice, of self-control, of reciprocal recognition of rights and of forbearence," and that "outside the state, just as within the state, peace will be permanently preserved only by carrying into our dealings one with another the sentiment of fraternity and the spirit of conciliation."

New York City.

David Starr Jordan

Chancellor of Leland Stanford Jr. University

I have read with great interest and sympathy Mr. Holt's proposition of a League of Peace against war and against armament. No one can tell what the future will bring, but it is not impossible that some such scheme will come within the range of practicable politics.

The people of the civilized world have been roughly divided into two classes, the Imperialists and the Democrats—those who believe that force is the foundation of government, and those who belive that the government should be a form of co-operation of the people concerned. Both classes are represented in every civilized nation, with a large residuum of a third class, those who take what comes and ask no questions, becoming thereby the allies or the tools of the first of these groups.

In the movement of history, the second class has grown steadily at the expense of the third, for popular education means democracy. The voice of the people is potent in the nations of western Europe, and it is supprest only for a time in the others.

In the imperial nations the man is, in theory, the chattel of the state. The existence and the righteousness of privilege is taken as a matter of course, for authority which does not spring from the people must arise thru privilege. If government rests on force as the expression of imperial will, this force must be measured in terms of armies. If armies are the foundations of government, they must be inherently righteous and their activities a necessary function of the state. The only function of an army is war. Hence a state founded on imperial will must be at war, active or passive, all the time.

Passive war is the threat of active war. By such threat, the will of the imperial state is enforced on all other states, which thru weakness, prudence or fear, may fail to assert themselves. And as the essential features of the imperial state is the absence of the checks and limitations, the con-

dition of war may be reached suddenly, almost automatically, if unexpected resistance should arise.

The philosophy of the imperial state has been in recent years brilliantly expounded by the historian, von Treitschke, and by his many recent echoes and dilutions. The resultant action finds recently cold-blooded exposition in General Von Bernhardi, and in hundreds of his colleagues in the propaganda of Pan-Germanism. The events of the last two months, from the attempted seizure of Servia to the desecration of Rheims, are all part of a program pre-arranged on the theory of the right of imperial overlordship, and of the expansion of Germanic culture thru the force of German military efficiency.

In the democratic nation, the government exists for the needs of the people concerned. The people possess the government and whatever machinery, temporary or permanent, the government may find necessary for its own continuation of security. A democracy cannot consistently make war, either active or passive war, except in self-defense, against the menace of uncontrolled neighbors. It cannot exult in war for war's sake, nor can it cringe before a special military caste, privileged above other citizens.

It is conceivable that, out of the havoc of the present war, there may arise conditions favorable for the establishment of a League of Peace. This hopeful possibility has been admirably stated by Mr. Holt. It is the duty of every friend of democracy to work for all movements which favor permanent peace.

There are many side currents in the present war, for no war was ever free—even at its inception—from selfish influences. But in its essence it has become a revolt against the rule of force, a rebellion against all divine right of kings or of armies, of all devices designed to uphold privilege against freedom and of personal will over law.

It was once said that our "Union could not endure half slave, half free." In like fashion, Europe could not exist half democracy, half autocracy; the divine rights of kings and

of armies, alongside of the diviner "right of man, the million trained to be free."

It is natural for the people who do not want war, neither active war nor passive war, to combine against those who do. Their formal union for peace may mark the beginning of the federation of Europe, for the benefit of Europe's own people. In such a federation Germany should be an honored member whenever the time shall come for the German people to take charge of the administration of Germany.

Stanford University

THEODORE MARBURG

Formerly United States Minister to Belgium

The world will be especially ripe for Mr. Holt's suggestion of a League of Peace after the present disastrous war. Unfortunately it seems that each generation must learn anew its lesson of war. After the present struggle so many lands will have had that bitter experience that we may naturally look for a long era of peace such as followed the protracted and widespread Napoleonic wars. But it is while the picture of this cataclysm is still throbbing in the minds of men that action should be had on the subject of setting up institutions which promise to make wars more difficult. Mr. Holt has aptly pointed out that "Peace follows justice, justice follows law and law follows political organization." It is therefore organization of various kinds for which the world should strive when this awful contest is stilled. His suggestion of a group of nations organized for peace might prove fruitful if the group in question should represent a combined power sufficient to overawe the lawlessly inclined.

When, after blocking in various ways the movement for the better organization of the society of nations, Germany disdainfully brushed aside Mr. Churchill's proposal for a "naval holiday," a suggestion which brought forth a resolution of hearty approval from the Congress of the United States and with which other powers sympathized, some of us began to

feel that perhaps the only way to stop militarism and the armament craze was for the rest of the world to combine against Germany and if necessary overthrow the system by overthrowing the bureaucracy and the military class of Germany. It is this task of putting down the law-breaker which England and her allies have now set themselves.

England saved Belgium in 1870 by notifying both France and Germany that she would take up arms against the country that violated Belgium's neutrality. When, in response to England's inquiry at the beginning of the present struggle, France declared her intention to respect that neutrality and Germany declined to do so, England declared war on Germany. Where would English honor be and where the chivalry of the world if Germany had been suffered to trample Belgium to death without a protest?

If we could secure a promise now from the allies, Great Britain, France, Russia, Japan, Belgium and Servia, to join a League of Peace, formed somewhat on the lines indicated by Mr. Holt, as a condition precedent to our doing what we ought to do anyway, namely, vent our righteous indignation at the way in which Germany has outraged Belgium and has trampled under foot the law of nations and the moral law alike, we should be accomplishing the double object of helping to crush militarism and of setting up an institution which might bring about a marked decline of war.

Are we not again at a turning point in history? and will it not be for good or accentuated evil accordingly as the right-minded nations see their duty?

Baltimore, Maryland

RICHARD OLNEY

Formerly Secretary of State

The disarmament required of the members of the suggested League of Peace must, I think, be a condition of the League's becoming operative at all. The parties to it will be nations armed and equipped for war against all enemies. Their

good faith as Leaguers should be evidenced by their simultaneous disarming as required by the provisions of the League. They can do so by disposing of all excessive armament, either to the League itself or in some other proper and effective method. They will do so, of course, only if first satisfied that their action will not imperil national safety.

By what process will they reach a conclusion on that point? They will no doubt give due effect to logic and theoretical reasoning. But the governing influence, I think, will be the practical results shown by the operation of that international League of Peace which in its nature and scope comes nearest to the proposed League. That League is found in the Constitution of the United States, a League universally deemed to be the best devised and the most important and successful of all similar leagues. It has been in operation for a century and a quarter. What is its record as a preventive of war? It did not prevent the war of secession, the longest and bloodiest of civil wars. On the other hand, but for the Constitution the history of this country since 1789 would probably have been a continuous chronicle of incessant wars.

But a Constitution, or international League of Peace, which, during 125 years has caused the parties to it to be at peace with one another with a single exception, has a right, even tho that exception be a momentous one, to be deemed a most powerful conservator of international peace. On the whole, therefore, the merit of your proposal is affirmed by the experience of the people of the United States under their national Constitution—not as being a certain preventive of war but as clearly tending in that direction. As compared with the League of Peace established by our national Constitution, a League embracing all the great powers of the world presents enormous difficulties. But enormous difficulties are not necessarily insuperable, and it is an additional merit of your proposal that, leaving the realm of mere aspirations and dreams, it presents something definite and tangible as a goal which the peace-lovers of all countries may unite in seeking to reach.

Boston, Massachusetts

JAMES GROVER MCDONALD

Assistant Professor of European History

May I express to you my complete agreement with your recent article, "The Way to Disarm"? The world should be made to see that the four steps in the evolution of private law, which have been so well pointed out by Professor Lawrence, have in a rudimentary manner been exactly paralleled in the development of international law. With this parallel in mind, public opinion will understand that international peace is not a hopeless ideal, but rather the natural result of a long development. With this understanding as a basis, pacifists should, following your lead, boldly advocate the creation of governmental machinery which will make possible the enforcement of peace among nations. Too much has been said and written about the horrors of war, too little has been done toward the working out of definite and tangible international institutions. Your suggestion for a League of Peace is an admirable example of the kind of constructive and positive suggestion which is so badly needed.

Indiana University.

PARK BENJAMIN

Author of "The History of the U. S. Naval Academy"

Mr. Holt's thesis seems to be that the time has gone by when any individual member of the family of nations should wield a military power equal to the aggregate military powers of at least any two other members, and that such preponderating power should hereafter be lodged in all the members unitedly or in a collection of as many of them as can be got to unite. In other words—to use current Wall Street slang—he wants to "syndicate the proposition." This is certainly constructive and should be the approved plan until somebody can suggest something better. From a military viewpoint, the syndicate scheme would be the most economical of all, since it would save the multiplication of enormously expensive ex-

periments, repeated over and over again by individual nations, and concentrate all into a series of crucial tests worked out to the end. Things like the present battleship, which are not true evolutionary products and which continue only by a sort of inertia, would very speedily be improved out of existence; and it would not be necessary, as now, to wait for a war to find out what is an effective weapon and what is not.

New York City.

CASPAR C. GOODRICH

Rear Admiral United States Navy, Retired

Some years ago, in *The Nineteenth Century and After,* I advocated in International Police, since back of all court judgments must be the strong arm of the state, something now lacking at The Hague. Your League of Peace offers a possible solution of the problem of how to raise and maintain such an International Police. I think you will find, in this case, that "Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte." Let three, say, of the greater powers become charter members and other powers, great and small, will hasten to join. Can you secure those three? There is the crux of the matter. I hope you can, for if you do, the trick will be turned.

Pomfret, Conn.

GEORGE A. PLIMPTON

President of Ginn & Company

The League of Peace seems to me an excellent suggestion. We must follow the trend of evolution. The fact that peace has been secured within individual countries warrants the belief that the next step will be peace between these countries, and the methods that have brought this internal peace must be adopted to obtain international peace. I do not think you exaggerate the importance of the part which the United States will play in the final solution of the problem. Our efforts will surely be disinterested.

New York City.

William I. Hull

Author of "The Two Hague Conferences"

Mr. Holt's article renders two signal services to the discussion of the great problem of international peace. First—it emphasizes the fact of fundamental importance that it is primarily a *political* problem, namely, the organization of a world federation and the substitution of law for force. Second—it emphasizes the competitive increase of armaments as one of the prime causes of the present war, and proposes a concrete method of reducing national armaments to a minimum.

As to practical carrying out of the plan suggested by him, I would urge that the League shall be agreed upon by *all* of the nations of the third Hague Conference and shall go into effect when ratified by three-fourths of the governments represented at that conference. This amendment would be in line with the precedent set in the adoption of the United States Constitution, and would have the great advantage of being based upon the twentieth century principle of a world-wide agreement and not upon the principle of partial alliances which has caused so much trouble in the past and which is the other prime cause (together with the competitive increase in armaments) of the present war.

Swarthmore, Penn.

Samuel Bowles

Editor of the Springfield Republican

I have read with interest, sympathy and approval your plan for an international League of Peace.

Springfield, Mass.

William H. Short

Secretary of the New York Peace Society

I believe that your article will attract widespread and favorable attention. In those far off times before the begin-

ning of the Great War in August, 1914—far off as measured by the movement of thought on international affairs—we were told by those best acquainted with the governing classes of Europe, that such things as your article contains must not be said. We were assured that the nations of Europe were controlled by governing castes which did not want to hand over any of their perogatives to an international government. We were asked to draw a veil over the eyes of our seers and to curb the enthusiasm of our orators. We were assured that the unwillingness of Europe to have a meeting of the third Hague Peace Conference take place was due to the fact that they had been offended and had taken fright at the rash suggestions which had come to them from America looking toward the establishment of a world federation for peace. The diplomats were, no doubt, right at that time. A new situation, however, now exists, or will exist before the end of this awful war, in which projects hitherto impossible of accomplishment may prove to be within the realm of practical politics. We are, therefore, permitted to hope that at no distant day the nations may be ready to adopt the simple, practical and altogether desirable plan you propose for guaranteeing the possessions and the right of the justice-loving nations by means of a non-burdensome, non-militaristic, international police.

New York City.

JOHN L. HARRIS

President of the Board of Education

The able and timely editorial, "The Way to Disarm," has given new vigor to the peace movement and has again aroused to action many discouraged peace advocates.

Kelso, Wash.

Topeka State Journal

The proposal made by Mr. Holt is a distinctive and definite one, where generalities have been the order before, and one that merits the careful consideration of the peace protagonists. He has done a valuable service in its presentation.

New York Evening Post

That the world should go on, after the appalling experiences which it is now undergoing, upon the old basis of mere blind competition in preparedness for general destruction, is a prospect to which no thinking mind can reconcile itself. When the bloodshed and devastation come to an end, the best thought in every nation must be centered upon the possibilities of remedy. And it is not improbable that it will be along some such lines as those indicated by Mr. Holt that the remedy will be sought.

Christian Science Monitor

No doubt, like the federation of the colonies that shaped the first compact under which the United States began national existence, the looseness of such a league would in time force action that would insure a more closely knit world-state pledged to peace. The point to be noted now is that, as a result of the present war, statesmen and publicists in all countries begin to talk about the end of militarism and about making a peace for peace's sake, and on a basis that will make another great martial conflict impossible. An alliance to conserve world stability, commercial prosperity and national fraternity comes to be talked of as the successor of recent triple alliances and ententes. Mr. Holt is using his liberty as a thinker to get his plan before the public; and for his enterprise and zeal deserves praise.

St. Joseph News

In the Independent, Hamilton Holt has a suggestion for establishing permanent peace after the present European war shall have been ended.

One is reminded of Tennyson's dream in Locksley Hall of

> The parliament of man,
> The federation of the world.

However, it is of dreams that all progress comes and who can say that the "League of Peace" may not come to pass

some day. That it may, and soon, is the prayer of all Americans.

Pittsburgh Post

In The Independent, Hamilton Holt has a suggestion for Holt has an article entitled, "How to Disarm." It is worth serious attention now, and the time may arrive, after this war's grand settlement day, when the nations will be eager to accept in principle the ideas he advances.

Kansas City Star

Doubtless Mr. Holt's suggestion will be dismissed as "impractical" by many European statesmen—perhaps by most of them. But is there anything less "practical" than the work of the "practical" statesmen which has resulted in the catastrophe of the present war?

Syracuse Herald

If Mr. Holt's imaginary League of Peace had existed three months ago, and had embraced in its membership all the European powers, or the powers outside of the Triple Alliance, the war would have been an impossibility.

Wilmington Every Evening

Mr. Hamilton Holt, the able editor of The Independent, offers to the public a proposition of disarmament, as a prelude to abandonment of wars between nations .

Why not? It is evident from the bloody experiences that Europe has undergone during the past few years and is still groaning under, that modern war is a great slaughter, a tremendous destruction of property. It is admitted, also, that nations may, if they will, get along without resort to the arbitrament of cruel war.

Milwaukee Journal

When Mr. Holt or any other man proposes a plan for insuring world peace, he takes it out of the realm of visions

for the future and puts it up to us now as our responsibility. And history shows us that once such a question is really raised it does not down until it is settled and settled rightly.

Army and Navy Journal

Proceeding from certain false premises Mr. Holt naturally reaches mistaken conclusions and his scheme seems to us to go to the very limit of impracticability.

The Church Peace Union

(Founded by Andrew Carnegie)

TRUSTEES

Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D., LL.D., Baltimore, Md.
Rev. Arthur Judson Brown, D.D., LL.D., New York.
Rev. Francis E. Clark, D.D., LL.D., Boston, Mass.
President W. H. P. Faunce, D.D., LL.D., Providence, R. I.
His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons, Baltimore, Md.
Rt. Rev. David H. Greer, D.D., LL.D., New York
Rev. Frank O. Hall, D.D., New York.
Bishop E. R. Hendrix, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.
Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch, LL.D., Chicago, Ill.
Hamilton Holt, New York.
Professor William I. Hull, Ph.D., Swarthmore, Pa.
Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D.D., LL.D., New York.
Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, LL.D., Chicago, Ill.
Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., Boston, Mass.
Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D., New York.
Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, Ph.D., New York.
Marcus M. Marks, New York
Dean Shailer Mathews, D.D., LL.D., Chicago, Ill.
Edwin D. Mead, M.A., Boston, Mass.
Rev. William Pierson Merrill, D.D., LL.D., New York.
John R. Mott, LL.D., New York
George A. Plimpton, LL.D., New York.
Rev. Julius B. Remensnyder, D.D., LL.D., New York.
Judge Henry Wade Rogers, LL.D., New York.
Robert E. Speer, D.D., New York.
Francis Lynde Stetson, New York.
James J. Walsh, M.D., New York.
Bishop Luther B. Wilson, D.D., LL.D., New York.